

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9-11, 14-17, 19, 21-23, 25-27, 30-34, 38 and 39 are presently pending. Claims 1, 4, 9-11, 17, 23, 32-34, 38 and 39 are amended herein. Claims 5, 6, 13, 18, 20, 35 and 40-41 are herein cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0004] Examiner Shah graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on October 16, 2008. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner’s willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0005] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from cited reference Yan. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0006] I understood Examiner Shah to tentatively concur that the proposed amendments to claims 1, 17 and 32 appeared to overcome the cited reference. Examiner Shah also tentatively indicated that, based on the proposed amendments to claim 23, he was considering whether a restriction requirement would be proper.

[0007] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0008] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0009] Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0010] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 4, 9-11, 17, 23, 32-34, 38 and 39 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are fully supported by the Application and are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited reference.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 102

[0011] Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-23, 25-27, 30-35 and 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being anticipated by a published article titled “Security Issues in Online Games” by Jianxin Jeff Yan & Hyun-Jin Choi (“Yan”). In light of the amendments presented herein and the decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

[0012] Independent claim 1, as amended, recites (in part with emphasis added):

deciding...the player-exploitable game conditions..., the deciding comprising:

setting a threshold against which the play of the one or more players is compared...;

triggering a player monitor for one or more potential cheating players whose rate of acquiring the scores and virtual objects is greater than the threshold, the player monitor logging game data about activities of the one or more potential cheating players in the game, ...;

determining the one or more potential cheating players are cheating in the game based at least in part on the logged game data, and in an event the one or more potential cheating players are cheating in the game:

identifying the player-exploitable game conditions of which the one or more potential cheating player are taking the advantage in the game

[0013] In view of the amendments above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are not proper because, for each rejected claim, no single reference discloses each and every element of that rejected claim. (“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); also see MPEP §2131).

[0014] In particular, at least the emphasized features, e.g., “triggering a player monitor for one or more potential cheating players,” “determining the one or more potential cheating players,” and “identifying the player-exploitable game conditions” are not taught or disclosed in Yan.

[0015] As discussed during the Interview, Yan merely enumerates different types of cheating in online games and provides a brief introduction of methods regarding prevention, detection and management of the online cheatings. Yan, however, is completely silent with respect to the at least the above features.

[0016] Accordingly, amended claim 1 is respectfully asserted patentably distinct from Yan. Independent claims 17, 23 and 32 are amended to incorporate similar features, and therefore are also asserted patentably distinct from Yan for at least the similar reasons presented above with reference to claim 1.

[0017] In addition to the reasons provided above with reference to claim 1, claim 17 is respectfully asserted to be patentably distinct from Yan for the following reason.

[0018] Independent claim 17, as amended, recites (in part with emphasis added):

a computer program encoding a game including a cheater detection portion
... the cheating detection portion comprising:

a player game scoring portion configured to keep record of how well one or more players are performing in a game;

a player monitor portion configured to determine whether the one or more players are likely to be cheating based on the record provided by the player game scoring portion by comparing actual rate of acquiring scores by the one or more players against a threshold;

a criteria based logging portion configured to log game data including scores and virtual objects of the one or more players in the game over an extended duration, the game data being analyzed to identify the one or more player-exploitable game conditions in the game and detect the players who are exploiting the one or more player-exploitable game conditions; and

an alert portion configured to transmit alert messages reporting the one or more player-exploitable game conditions and the cheating players

[0019] Yan briefly introduces several methods to detect, prevent and manage cheating in games. Yan, however, fails to teach or disclose an enabled system having the emphasized features, e.g., the “cheating detection portion” in claim 17.

[0020] In addition to the reasons provided above with reference to the amended claim 1, independent claim 23 is respectfully asserted patentably distinct for the following reason.

[0021] Independent claim 23, as amended, recites (in part with emphasis added):

monitoring play of a plurality of players for one or more player-exploitable game conditions on a game server, the one or more player-exploitable game

conditions *comprising one or more of a rollover situation and a dupping situation in which one or more cheating players take an unfair advantage by exploiting such situation without hacking the game*, wherein:

the rollover situation happens in the game where number of digits for scoring, purchasing or other game activities are too low to describe all potential transactions; and

the dupping situation happens in the game where one or more cheating players duplicate an item by exploiting buffer overrun code in a manner that causes a game server to crash and recover with user data reflecting game status of the one or more cheating players prior to the game server crash;

[0022] Applicant respectfully submits that at least the emphasized features, e.g., the “rollover situation” and “dupping situation”, are not taught or disclosed in Yan. In fact, Yan is completely silent with respect to the emphasized features.

[0023] Therefore, independent claim 23 is also asserted patentably distinct from Yan.

Dependent Claims

[0024] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0025] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Ningning Xu Reg. No. L0293/

Dated: October 22, 2008

Ningning Xu (ningning@leehayes.com; x226)
Registration No. L0293

Bea Koempel-Thomas (bea@leehayes.com; x259)
Registration No. 58,213
Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com